

4.10 LAND USE

4.10.1 Introduction

This section describes the regulatory and environmental setting, as well as identified impacts and mitigation measures, for land use and land use planning. Land use planning is used to direct the amount, type, and location of different land uses; balance land uses with consideration of the social, environmental, and economic well-being of the County; and coordinate site-specific land uses with land uses in surrounding areas. As a document tiered from the Placer County General Plan, the SAP defines goals, policies, implementing programs, and zoning intended to guide development of the area consistent with the County's General Plan and achieve the County's land use and planning vision for the 8,497-acre project area.

Important terms for specific parts of the project are discussed in detail in Section 4.0, "Approach to the Environmental Analysis." The following brief discussion is intended to remind the reader how those terms are defined and used in the EIR analysis, including this section. "SAP area" refers to the entire SAP area, which includes the PRSP area. "Net SAP area" refers to the portion of the SAP area outside the PRSP area. The "project" encompasses the entirety of the SAP, including the PRSP and all associated off-site improvements. "Project area" refers to the entire area covered by the project. Because the project area is composed of three pieces (the net SAP area, the PRSP area, and areas where other off-site infrastructure would support the project), the impact analysis typically is divided into three subsections: "Net SAP Area," "PRSP Area," and "Other Supporting Infrastructure." ("Other Supporting Infrastructure" refers to improvements outside the SAP area and is divided into "Pleasant Grove Retention Facility" and "Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements.") Some required infrastructure improvements are planned outside the PRSP area but still in the SAP area; those improvements are addressed in the "PRSP Area" sections.

The following information sources were used in preparation of the land use analysis:

- ▲ Placer County General Plan (adopted 1994, as updated in 2013) (Placer County 2013),
- ▲ Placer County General Plan EIR (Placer County 1997),
- ▲ Sunset Industrial Area Plan (1997 and amended in 2005) (Placer County 1997),
- ▲ Draft Sunset Area Plan (Placer County 2018a),
- ▲ Draft Placer Ranch Specific Plan (Placer County 2018b),
- ▲ Placer County Sunset Industrial Area Plan Update Existing Conditions Report (Placer County 2015), and
- ▲ Sunset Area Plan and Placer Ranch Specific Plan Urban Decay Analysis (EPS 2018).

A resource-specific analysis of consistency with Placer County General Plan policies is provided in each resource section. Conflicts with applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans are addressed in Section 4.4, "Biological Resources." Effects on agricultural operations are addressed in Section 4.2, "Agricultural Resources." Physical impacts (e.g., air emissions, traffic generation, soil disturbance) resulting from proposed land uses are addressed by resource in other sections of this EIR. Therefore, these topics are not discussed further in this section of the EIR.

Because the project itself is a large-scale area plan and embedded specific plan, it is required to be consistent with the County General Plan; assessment of "conflict with the General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning" takes the form of resource-specific analyses of consistency with Placer County General Plan policies in each resource section, described above. Additionally, the potential for incompatible land uses is discussed in this section.

The Placer County Environmental Checklist also requires assessment of conflict with "[p]lan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect." As described in detail in Chapter 3, "Project Description," the project proposes an amendment to General Plan Policy 4.G.11, the purpose of which is to protect landfill facilities from incompatible encroachment. The policy currently requires that "new

residential land uses...be separated from the property lines of active and future landfill sites by a buffer of one mile," or 5,280 feet. The proposed policy would allow residential development as close as 1,000 feet to the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL) with approval of a specific plan, master plan, or a development agreement with certain requirements. Without a specific plan or development agreement, the minimum buffer zone would be 2,000 feet. This policy change is addressed below in Impact 4.10-2, Consistency and compatibility with the WRSL; in Section 4.3, "Air Quality," Impact 4.3-6, Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people; and in Section 4.15, "Utilities," Impact 4.15-11, Potential impact on WRSL from incompatible land use that results in insufficient permitted capacity to serve waste disposal needs.

In addition, because the project is intended to result in land use designations, zoning and implementation policies that would implement the County's vision for the project area, assessment of "substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area" for the purposes of identifying significant impacts, is inapplicable.

This analysis focuses on land use consistency and compatibility of the project with surrounding development and with the WRSL, the potential to disrupt or divide an existing community, the potential for economic or social changes to result in urban decay or deterioration, and the potential for cumulative land use impacts.

Several comments on land use matters were received in response to the NOP, including requests for analyses of the project's consistency with County policies related to urban development, land use compatibility with existing open space preserves, and proximity of sensitive land uses to the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill. These and other land use issues are addressed herein.

As discussed in Chapter 1, "Introduction," the PRSP land use plan has been slightly revised since circulation of the NOP. Changes primarily relate to increasing the distance between the landfill property and land designated for residential development, modifying the density of proposed residential areas, reducing the proposed commercial intensity, slightly decreasing the acreage of open space, and increasing the acreage of parks to meet County parkland provision standards. The size of the PRSP area (2,213 acres) has not changed since release of the NOP, and the overall area of development would be nearly identical. The minor reduction in residential development density and commercial intensity does not change the type of land uses proposed but reduces the number of units or amount of floor area proposed in certain areas of the PRSP land use plan. This would not appreciably change the land use pattern either within the PRSP area or outside the PRSP area. Furthermore, a memorandum was prepared to evaluate whether the revisions to the PRSP would alter the conclusions (see Appendix P). The memorandum found that conclusions of the urban decay analysis would not change. Therefore, impacts associated with the land use plan analyzed in this EIR are essentially the same as the previous land use plan.

4.10.2 Environmental Setting

The SAP is a proposed update to the 1997 Sunset Industrial Area (SIA) Plan. The existing SIA covers 8,172 acres in unincorporated western Placer County. The proposed SAP area includes the SIA plus an additional 325 acres west of the SIA boundary, bringing the total SAP area to 8,497 acres. The PRSP area is located in the southern portion of the SAP and encompasses 2,213 acres of land within the SAP area. As shown in Exhibit 3-2, the SAP area is adjacent to the northern boundary of the City of Roseville, the southern boundary of the City of Lincoln, and the western boundary of the City of Rocklin. State Route (SR) 65 runs in a north-south direction just inside the eastern boundary of the SAP area.

Existing Land Uses

The SAP area consists primarily of open space, undeveloped grassland, and agricultural land, with scattered commercial and industrial developments. As described in Chapter 3, "Project Description," the project also includes other supporting infrastructure that extends beyond the boundary of the SAP, all within the City of Roseville. Land that would support the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility is currently undeveloped and used for field crops, except for a single farmhouse located outside the proposed retention basin footprint. Fiddymont Road and Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard, which would be improved, and beneath which would

contain sufficient water, wastewater, and dry utilities infrastructure to support the project, are roadways within residential development. Duluth Avenue, Sunset Boulevard, and Industrial Avenue, which would also be widened corridors of new and improved infrastructure, are roadways within industrial development and agricultural areas. The Woodcreek Recycled Water Tank site, where minor improvements could be made, is within a golf course adjacent to residential areas.

When it was adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors in 1997, the SIA Plan envisioned the area as a job center that would provide regional benefit and create primary-wage-earner jobs for residents of local cities and unincorporated areas. The SIA Plan recognized that the plan area was large and development would likely be slow because of a lack of backbone infrastructure, economic conditions, and other factors. A key strategic goal, however, was to preserve an area for opportunities that would not be precluded because of residential encroachment.

The plan area experienced some business expansions and new development activity since 1997. Thunder Valley Casino Resort, located at the intersection of Athens and Industrial Avenues, is the most significant new development in the plan area since 1997, now with a 297-room hotel, spa, concert venue, restaurants, and gaming facility. Additionally, some core industrial uses have been developed in the southeastern portion of the plan area.

Existing Land Use Designations and Zoning

The Land Use chapter in Part II of the SIA contains background information, goals, policies, and implementation programs pertaining to land use.

Land Use Designations

The current land use designations as described in the SIA Plan include the following (Placer County 2015:2-25–2-26):

- ▲ Agriculture 80 Acre (AG 80) and Agriculture 20 Acre (AG 20). These designations identify lands set aside for the production of food and fiber, including areas of prime and non-prime agricultural soils. Typical land uses allowed include crop production, orchards and vineyards, grazing, pasture and rangeland, other resource extraction activities, and facilities that directly support agricultural operations, such as agricultural products facilities. Allowable residential development in areas designated Agriculture includes one principal dwelling unit and one secondary dwelling unit per 80- or 20-acre parcel, as applicable, to allow for caretaker/employee housing and farm worker housing.
- ▲ Open Space (OS). This designation is intended to identify and protect important open space lands within the SIA, including public lands specifically reserved or proposed for watershed preservation, outdoor recreation, wildlife/environmental preserves, sites or portions of sites with natural features such as unique topography, vegetation, habitat, or stream courses, and areas providing buffers between potentially incompatible types of land use, such as residential areas in surrounding jurisdictions and important community facilities that may be viewed as nuisances by residents (e.g., the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill). Typical land uses allowed within Open Space areas are limited to low-intensity agricultural and public recreational uses, with structural development being restricted to accessory structures necessary to support the primary allowed uses, habitat mitigation areas, and necessary public utility and safety facilities.
- ▲ General Commercial (GC). This designation identifies a variety of urban commercial areas including shopping districts, service commercial areas, office areas, and neighborhood-serving commercial centers. This designation has been applied to areas near major transportation corridors (i.e., Sunset Boulevard and State Route 65). Typical land uses allowed include retail stores, restaurants, offices, service commercial uses, hotel and motel uses, recreation, education and public assembly uses, medical services, child care facilities, necessary public utility and safety facilities, and similar and compatible uses. This designation is intended to provide goods and services to the businesses and employees working within the Sunset Industrial Area to reduce vehicle trips to other areas in the vicinity which currently provide these goods and services. For areas adjacent to SR 65, the designation is also

intended to permit the provision of goods and services, such as service stations, hotel and motel uses, and restaurants. High density residential uses, typically permitted with the residential zone districts associated with this land use designation, are to be strongly discouraged. Only caretaker or employee housing is deemed an acceptable residential land use in this designation.

- ▲ **Business Park (BP).** This designation provides for all types of employee-intensive industrial and professional uses including manufacturing, assembly, professional offices, and research and development facilities in a campus-like setting. The Business Park designation is intended to provide for businesses which involve large numbers of employees and which construct facilities that are attractive and environmentally sensitive. The types of industrial and office land uses encouraged are those with a substantial percentage of employee positions at primary wage earner levels, whose salaries are comparable to the county's median income level. Land uses that involve outdoor manufacturing or storage, or that emit any appreciable amount of visible gases, particulates, steam, heat, odors, vibrations, glare, dust or excessive noise are discouraged. The Business Park designation is intended for areas with high visibility and good access to major transportation routes. The only residential use allowed in this designation is caretaker/employee housing.
- ▲ **Industrial (I).** This designation provides for all types of manufacturing, assembly, storage and distribution, and research and development activities in settings ranging from industrial parks dominated by light industrial activities to heavy industrial areas which could include power plants, batch plants, outdoor manufacturing and other heavy industrial uses. This designation is applied to areas with good access to major truck transportation routes and rail lines. Typical land uses allowed include all types of manufacturing and processing uses (limited where necessary to ensure compatibility between adjoining land uses), business support services, retail and service commercial uses necessary to support manufacturing and processing activities and their employees, necessary public utility and safety facilities, and similar and compatible uses. The only residential use allowed in this designation is caretaker/employee housing.
- ▲ **Public Facility (PF).** This designation is applied to government-owned facilities and quasi-public facilities. The designation is applied to areas with existing public or quasi-public facilities and land uses, or to publicly-owned lands intended for development with public facilities. Typical land uses allowed include government offices, service centers and other institutional facilities, schools, cemeteries, solid and liquid waste facilities, necessary public utility and safety facilities, landfills and other solid waste facilities, and similar and compatible uses.

Table 4.10-1 identifies the land uses and acreages within the SIA Plan area as they were known in 2015.

Table 4.10-1 SIA Land Use Designations

Land Use Designation	Acreage	Percentage of Total
Agriculture 80 Acres (AG 80)	627	7.7
Agriculture 80 Acres (AG 80)	2,730	33.4
General Commercial (GC)	41	0.5
Industrial (I)	3,827	46.8
Public Facility (PF)	783	9.6
Open Space (OS)	164	2.0
Total	8,172	100

Source: Placer County 2015:2-27

As part of the SAP, approximately 325 acres would be added to the plan area. This land is adjacent to the existing SIA Plan boundary west of Aitken Road, south of Athens Avenue, and north of Sunset Boulevard. This land is vacant, but currently designated as Agriculture (AG) 80 acre minimum by the Placer County General Plan, which describes the AG 80 designation as follows:

- ▲ This designation identifies land for the production of food and fiber, including areas of prime agricultural soils, and other productive and potentially productive lands where commercial agricultural uses can exist without creating conflicts with other land uses, or where potential conflicts can be mitigated. Typical land uses allowed include: crop production, orchards and vineyards, grazing, pasture and rangeland, hobby farms; other resource extraction activities; facilities that directly support agricultural operations, such as agricultural products processing; and necessary public utility and safety facilities. Allowable residential development in areas designated Agriculture includes one principal dwelling and one secondary dwelling per lot, caretaker/employee housing, and farm worker housing.

Zoning

Zoning is the primary tool used to implement a general plan. A major difference between a general plan and a zoning ordinance is that the general plan provides guidance on the location, type, and density of new growth and development over the long-term, while the zoning ordinance provides detailed development and use standards for each parcel of land. The zoning ordinance divides the community into zoning districts and specifies the uses that are permitted, conditionally permitted, and prohibited within each district. The Placer County Zoning Ordinance is used to regulate the use and development of property within the SIA. The Ordinance establishes 23 zoning districts; six of which are applied to land within the SIA. In addition, the Placer County Zoning Ordinance establishes 14 combining districts (i.e., districts that are used in combination with the base zone district to address special needs or characteristics of the area); seven of which are applied to land within the SIA. The existing zoning districts used in the SIA are described below (Placer County 2015: 2-33–2-34):

- ▲ Open Space (O). The purpose of this zoning district is to protect important open space lands within Placer County by limiting allowable land uses to low intensity agricultural and public recreational uses, with structural development being restricted to accessory structures necessary to support the primary allowed uses, and critical public facilities.
- ▲ Farm (F). The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for the conduct of commercial agricultural operations that can also accommodate necessary services to support agricultural uses, together with residential land uses at low population densities.
- ▲ General Commercial (C-2). This zoning district is intended to provide areas for the continued use, enhancement, and new development of retail, personal service, entertainment, office, and related commercial uses that will attract patrons from all areas of the community and region. The C2 district will be located mainly along major transportation corridors.
- ▲ Business Park (BP). The purpose of this zoning district is to designate areas appropriate for the development of a mixture of light industrial, office, and commercial land uses in a campus-like setting. Such uses may include high technology manufacturing and assembly, warehousing, professional offices, research and development, and commercial uses that are primarily for the support of the employees of other businesses in the district and the businesses themselves.
- ▲ Industrial (I). This zoning district is intended for a wide range of industrial activities including manufacturing, assembly, wholesale distribution, and storage.
- ▲ Industrial Park (INP). This zoning district is intended primarily for light industrial uses such as manufacturing, assembly, research and development and similar industrial uses, as well as limited commercial and office uses that are compatible and appropriate along with industrial uses. Site development in the industrial park district is characterized by careful attention to attractive building design, landscaping, and less site coverage than in other commercial and industrial districts.

The County designated combining districts for several areas of the SIA. The combining districts include (Placer County 2015: 2-34):

- ▲ Design Review Scenic Corridor (-Dc). The purpose of this design review combining district is to provide special regulations to protect and enhance the aesthetic character of lands and buildings within public view, protect historic buildings, minimize any adverse impacts of conflicting land uses, enhance tourism through the protection of lands and buildings having unique aesthetic characteristics, and to provide special project review procedures for lands and uses which by their nature require special attention to landscaping, circulation, and/or energy conservation.
- ▲ Building Site (-B-X). The purpose of this combining district is to provide for different parcel sizes than would otherwise be required in an applicable zone district, based upon special characteristics of the site or area to which the combining district is applied, including but not limited to sensitive environmental characteristics, limited resource capacities, and community character. The -X indicates that the minimum building site is established on the zoning map.
- ▲ Flood Hazard (-FH). The purpose of this combining district is to identify areas where hazards to life or property exist because of the potential for inundation by a one hundred (100) year frequency flood.
- ▲ Use Permit Required (-UP). The purpose of this combining district is to identify sensitive areas of Placer County where any proposed use or development will raise significant land use policy issues and/or community concerns, and therefore should not be considered for approval without a conditional or minor use permit.
- ▲ Special Purpose (-SP). This combining district identifies specific areas near mineral extraction operations, airports, sewage treatment plans, or waste disposal facilities where land use compatibility issues are of particular importance.
- ▲ Development Reserve (-DR). The purpose of this combining district is to provide for the future development of limited residential, commercial or industrial uses in areas that are identified by the general plan or community plan but may not be developed until infrastructure or resources have been provided or additional population growth has occurred.

Table 4.10-2 identifies the zoning and acreages within the SIA Plan area as they were known in 2015.

Zoning Designation	Acreage	Percentage of Total
Open Space (O)	807	9.9
Farm (F)	5,583	68.3
General Commercial (C2)	30	0.4
Business Park (BP)	137	1.7
Industrial (IN)	94	1.2
Industrial Park (INP)	1,521	18.6
Total	8,172	100

Source: Placer County 2015:2-27

As described above, as part of the proposed SAP, approximately 325 acres west of the existing SIA plan area (west of Aitken Road, south of Athens Avenue, and north of Sunset Boulevard) would be added to the project area. This land is vacant and currently zoned as F-B-X-AO (80-acre minimum) and F-B-X (80-acre minimum). The Placer County General Plan describes these zoning types as allowing agricultural and residential uses with a minimum parcel size of 80 acres. The zoning designation F-B-X-AO is also intended to address compatibility between agricultural and residential uses and with airport sites.

Surrounding Land Uses

Land uses surrounding the SAP area include agriculture, open space, undeveloped areas, and residential and commercial developments. To the south and east of the SAP area, additional residential areas are currently being developed, with even more land around the SAP area slated for mixed-use development (e.g., Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan to the west, approved for annexation to the City of Roseville and Village 7 to the north, annexed to the City of Lincoln). A residential community in the North Roseville Specific Plan area is located directly to the south of the SAP area, and additional residential areas are being developed in the City of Roseville (e.g., in the West Roseville Specific Plan Area) to the south of the SAP area. East of SR-65, within the cities of Rocklin and Lincoln, there are commercial, residential, educational, and other types of development. Some residential areas continue to develop (e.g., Whitney Ranch). Planned and existing development are shown in Exhibit 4.0-1.

Existing Development

Existing development concentrated in the eastern portion of the SAP area is commercial and light industrial, and there are scattered developed uses throughout the SAP area. Residential development partially abuts the southern, western, and northern boundaries of the SAP area. Because of the distances between these land uses, their locations in different jurisdictions, and lack of cohesion around any common center, these developments and the scattered uses throughout the SAP area do not constitute an established community. The SAP area is also located at the western edge of rapidly developing areas of western Placer County. Land to the west of the SAP is largely in agricultural use, but a variety of other developments are proposed in the remaining undeveloped lands surrounding the SAP area.

4.10.3 Regulatory Setting

FEDERAL

There are no federal regulations that pertain to land use that are applicable to the proposed project.

STATE

Planning and Zoning Law, Government Code Sections 65000–66035

California Planning and Zoning Law requires each city to prepare and adopt “a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the...city, and of any land outside its boundaries” (Cal. Government Code § 65300). Under Government Code Section 65302, each general plan must include the following seven elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, and Safety.

Area plans are not specifically mentioned in statute; however, they are authorized under § 65301(b), which allows individual sections of the general plan to be devoted to a particular subject or geographic area. In addition, they are also allowed as optional elements or subjects under Section 65303. Area plans address a particular region or community within the overall planning area of the general plan. An area plan is adopted as a general plan amendment. It refines the policies and designates land use of the general plan as they apply to smaller geographic areas, and is implemented by local ordinances such as those regulating land use and subdivisions. Area plans also provide forums for resolving local conflicts among competing interests. An area plan must be consistent with the general plan of which it is a part, and it may only be adopted or amended by resolution (OPR 2001).

Specific plans are policy documents that act as a bridge between the County’s General Plan and Zoning Regulations for development of a particular area. Government Code Section 65450 states that a city (or county) may prepare a specific plan “for the systematic implementation of the general plan for all or part of the area covered by the general plan.” A specific plan must be consistent with the general plan and is adopted in the same manner as a general plan (Cal. Government Code § 65453) and is considered a legislative act. A specific plan may only be amended by resolution.

Senate Bill 375 of 2008

SB 375, signed by Governor Schwarzenegger in September 2008, aligns regional transportation planning efforts, regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets, and land use and housing allocation. Senate Bill (SB) 375 requires metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or Alternative Planning Strategy, showing prescribed land use allocation in the Regional Transportation Plan of each MPO. The California Air Resources Board (CARB), in consultation with the MPOs, is to provide each affected region with reduction targets for GHGs emitted by passenger cars and light trucks in their respective regions for 2020 and 2035.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) serves as the MPO for Sacramento, Placer, El Dorado, Yuba, Sutter, and Yolo Counties, excluding those lands located in the Lake Tahoe Basin. SACOG adopted its Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) 2036 in 2012 and completed an update adopted on February 18, 2016 (SACOG 2016). SACOG was tasked by CARB to achieve a 7-percent-per-capita reduction compared to 2012 emissions by 2020 and a 16-percent-per-capita reduction by 2035, which CARB confirmed the region would achieve by implementing its SCS (CARB 2013). In June 2017, CARB released the proposed update for the SB 375 targets, tasking SACOG to achieve a 7-percent and a 19-percent per capita reduction by 2020 and 2035, respectively (CARB 2017). These targets have since been approved. The thrust of SB 375 pertains to the combination of land use and transportation strategies to reduce GHG emissions such that regional targets are achieved. See Section 4.7, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions."

LOCAL

Placer County General Plan

The Placer County General Plan contains the following land use policies relevant to connectivity of communities within Placer County:

- ▲ **Policy 1.A.3:** The County shall distinguish among urban/suburban and rural areas to identify where development will be accommodated and where public infrastructure and service will be provided. This pattern shall promote the maintenance of separate and distinct communities.
- ▲ **Policy 1.A.4:** The County shall promote patterns of development that facilitate the efficient and timely provision of urban infrastructure and services.
- ▲ **Policy 1.B.7:** The County shall require residential subdivisions to be designed to provide well-connected internal and external street and pedestrian systems with clear, unobstructed pedestrian paths of travel.
- ▲ **Policy 1.B.8:** The County shall discourage the development of isolated, remote, and/or walled residential projects that do not contribute to the sense of community desired for the area.

The Placer County General Plan contains the following policy regarding higher-density residential areas:

- ▲ **Policy 1.B.1:** The County shall promote the concentration of new residential development in higher-density residential areas located along major transportation corridors and transit routes.

The Placer County General Plan contains the following policy regarding buffering of sensitive uses from certain facilities:

- ▲ **Policy 4.G.11:** When considering land use changes in the vicinity of a landfill operation, the County shall consider the landfill as the dominant land use in the area. In order to protect these facilities from incompatible encroachment, new residential land uses shall be separated from the property lines of active and future landfill sites by a buffer of one mile. Such buffers do not apply to closed landfills or solid waste transfer stations. Other uses will be required to provide buffers as described in Table 1-5. The intent of this policy is to prohibit the creation of new parcels for residential use within one mile of the landfill; not to prohibit construction of a residence on an existing legal building site within this area.

The Placer County General Plan contains the following policy regarding buffering between agricultural and nonagricultural uses:

- ▲ **Policy 1.H.6:** The County shall require new non-agricultural development immediately adjacent to agricultural lands to be designed to provide a buffer in the form of a setback of sufficient distance to avoid land use conflicts between the agricultural uses and the nonagricultural uses, except as it may be determined to be unnecessary or inappropriate within a specific plan as part of the specific plan approval. Such setback or buffer areas shall be established by recorded easement or other instrument, subject to the approval of County Counsel. A method and mechanism (e.g., a homeowners association or easement dedication to a non-profit organization or public entity) for guaranteeing the maintenance of this land in a safe and orderly manner shall be also established at the time of development approval.

Placer County Zoning Ordinance

The current County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 17 of the Placer County Code, was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in July 1995 (Edition #1). The Zoning Ordinance, Eighth Edition, was revised in August 2003. The Zoning Ordinance implements the land use designations in the County General Plan and applicable community plans, regulates the use of land, buildings, and structures, and establishes minimum regulations and standards for the development of land in Placer County.

4.10.4 Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on the Placer County CEQA Checklist and Appendix G, “Environmental Checklist Form,” of the CEQA Guidelines, implementing the project would result in a potentially significant land use impact if it would:

- ▲ result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts,
- ▲ disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community), or
- ▲ cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration.

METHODS AND APPROACH

Assessment of consistency and compatibility of the project with surrounding development (see Impact 4.10-1) is based on aerial imagery, data from Placer County and surrounding jurisdictions, and land use analysis. Assessment of consistency and compatibility of the project with the WRSL, which is addressed separately from other surrounding development (see Impact 4.10-2), is based on research pertaining to existing and proposed WRSL facilities and operations, data from other landfills in California, and interviews with knowledgeable individuals.

Aerial imagery was analyzed to determine if buildout of the proposed project would divide an existing community, which could include restricting access within a community (e.g., by placing a utility corridor through a community) or isolating existing communities (e.g., by removing roads used to access existing communities). The analysis focuses on structures and development, consistent with proposed land uses, that would be present after buildout of the proposed project. Construction activities associated with homes, buildings, roads, and infrastructure would be distributed and temporary in any one location and therefore would not divide or isolate an established community.

The analysis of social and economic effects and their potential to create physical environmental effects is based on an analysis prepared for Placer County, in the *Sunset Area Plan and Placer Ranch Specific Plan Urban Decay Analysis* (EPS 2018).

PROPOSED SUNSET AREA PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

The SAP includes goals and policies related to community connectivity. The County would require that, with approval of land development projects under the SAP, applicants for such future projects implement these policies. The PRSP is intended to adhere to the goals and policies of the SAP. The following SAP policies are relevant to the analysis of division of an existing community:

- ▲ **LU/ED-10.3: Development Separators.** The County supports the maintenance of Preserve/Mitigation Reserve areas to establish separation between otherwise developed areas (e.g., the Sunset Area, Lincoln) and providing buffers between potentially incompatible uses.
- ▲ **LU/ED-11.3: Agricultural Buffer.** The County shall require new non-agricultural development immediately adjacent to agricultural lands to be designed to provide a buffer in the form of a setback of 50 feet to avoid land use conflicts between the agricultural uses and the nonagricultural uses.
- ▲ **TM-1.7: Internal Street Connectivity.** The County shall encourage large private developments (e.g., office parks, apartment complexes, retail centers) to provide internal streets and parking lots that connect to the existing public roadway system at County-approved locations and provide a seamless transition to existing and planned transportation facilities.
- ▲ **TM-1.8: Network Connectivity/Continuity.** The County shall coordinate with the cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln and the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency to ensure that arterial and collector roads are designed to provide connections between the Sunset Area and adjacent areas. This will include establishing parallel facilities that provide alternatives to relying on regional facilities (i.e., SR 65, Placer Parkway) for local trips.
- ▲ **TM-2.2: New Development Connectivity:** The County shall require new development to include a system of sidewalks, trails, and bikeways that link all land uses, provide accessibility to parks and schools, and connect to all existing and planned external street and trail facilities. Land use and development applications will need to demonstrate how proposed facilities will connect with the major connector nodes and corridor trails, as depicted in Figure 2-3 [of the SAP].

PROPOSED PLACER RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

The PRSP is described in Chapter 3, “Project Description.” Goals and objectives for the PRSP are provided in Section 3.4.3, “Placer Ranch Specific Plan Primary Objectives,” and PRSP characteristics are described in Section 3.5.2, “Placer Ranch Specific Plan.” The PRSP Development Standards and Design Guidelines do not provide specific measures that would pertain to community connectivity. However, the PRSP’s development plan has been designed to adhere to the SAP’s goals and policies pertaining to community connectivity.

LAND USE CHANGES

While approved plan conditions or designations do not constitute a permissible baseline from which to assess environmental impacts (*Environmental Planning and Information Council (EPIC) v. County of El Dorado*, [36 Cal. 3d 190]), the following information is provided to generally characterize the differences between the SIA Plan and the project from a land use perspective.

Net SAP Area

In the SIA Plan, the net SAP area is designated primarily for agriculture, public facilities, industrial, business park, and open space uses. The western and northeastern portions of the net SAP area are designated

Agricultural 80-acre minimum and Agricultural 20-acre minimum, respectively; the north-central, eastern, and southeastern portions are designated Industrial with small areas of Commercial designated along the Sunset Boulevard corridor; the central area is designated Public Facility and Public Facility/ Agricultural 80-acre minimum to accommodate the landfill and its operations; and the eastern portion, flanking SR 65 is designated Business Park (see Exhibit 6-1). Under the SIA Plan, urban uses would be allowed in the Business Park, Industrial, Commercial, and Public Facilities land use designations.

Implementation of the SAP would allow additional development in the net SAP area as compared to the SIA Plan and would alter the type of allowable development and the locations in which that development would occur. As described in Chapter 3, “Project Description,” the SAP would designate much of the northern portion of the net SAP area as Preserve/Mitigation Reserve; the central swath of the net SAP area would be designated as Urban Reserve, Innovation Center, Eco-Industrial (including the WRSL property and surrounding lands), Entertainment Mixed-Use, and Business Park; and the southeastern portion of the net SAP area would be designated Light Industrial, General Commercial, Business Park, and Public Facility. Under the SAP, the north-central portion of the net SAP area currently designated for industrial uses would be set aside under the Preserve/Mitigation Reserve land use designation. Conversely, the western portion of the net SAP area currently designated for agriculture, would accommodate uses permitted under the Innovation Center designation, with an additional portion designated Urban Reserve. Eco-Industrial uses would occupy the area currently designated as Public Facility and Public Facility/Agricultural 80-acre minimum, allowing higher levels of urbanization and development.

Overall, implementation of the SAP would, at buildout, intensify levels of development in the net SAP area and result in greater conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses than the SIA Plan, but it would also result in greater conservation of important habitat for special-status species and other sensitive habitat than the SIA Plan.

PRSP Area

The SIA Plan designates the western and central portions—the majority of the PRSP area—as Agricultural 80-acre minimum. The eastern area is designated as Industrial (see Exhibit 6-1). Implementation of the PRSP would concentrate residential uses (primarily low-density, with some pockets of medium and high-density) in the western portion of the PRSP area. Residential uses would be supported by commercial areas and areas for parks and recreation. Open space would be maintained along creeks and drainageways. The central and eastern portions of the PRSP area would be dominated by the Sac State–Placer Center; low-, medium-, and high-density residential; and commercial and mixed-use development.

Implementation of the PRSP would intensify levels of development in the PRSP area and result in greater conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural uses than the SIA Plan. Land use designations that would otherwise result in industrial uses in the eastern portion of the area under the SIA Plan would instead support the aforementioned Sac State–Placer Center, residential, commercial, and mixed-use development.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact 4.10-1: Consistency and compatibility with existing and planned development

Implementation of the SAP, including the PRSP, would convert, over buildout of the project, an 8,500-acre expanse of largely undeveloped land to urban uses, including residential, commercial, industrial, and educational uses. The plan would also include large expanses of open space, parks, and recreation facilities. While the future urban character of the project area would be less compatible with adjacent agricultural uses to the west, General-Plan-required buffers would be maintained in that area, and proposed uses would be consistent with the land uses, visual quality, and urban character of the cities of Roseville to the south, Rocklin to the east, and Lincoln to the north. Further, the project would be consistent with land use trends in the region, including the Amoruso Ranch project, the Creekview Specific Plan, the West Roseville Specific Plan, and Lincoln Village 7 Specific Plan and, therefore, the characterization of the area as a developing community in the MTP/SCS. This impact would be **less than significant**.

Net SAP Area

The net SAP area is mostly undeveloped lands with some areas of commercial and industrial development. The land to the west of the net SAP area is primarily used for agriculture with some land to the southwest slated for residential development (in unincorporated Placer County). The land to the north (in the City of Lincoln) is currently undeveloped farmland but also planned for development, largely with single-family residential subdivisions. The land to the east (in the City of Rocklin) is a mix of undeveloped land and land developed with commercial and educational uses. The PRSP area lies to the south, is currently undeveloped but proposed for residential, commercial, open space, and educational uses as described in Chapter 3, “Project Description.”

Implementation of the project would result in development of residential, industrial, and commercial uses in the net SAP area. While much of the surrounding land is developed or slated for development, the net SAP area is adjacent to large agricultural properties to the west. *Placer County General Plan* Goal 7.B provides that it is a goal of the County to “minimize existing and future conflicts between agricultural and non-agricultural uses in agriculturally-designated areas.” Following Goal 7.B are several policies, including 7.B.4, that support the County’s Right-to-Farm Ordinance and state nuisance laws. Agricultural buffers are also defined under the General Plan as those that are intended to separate potentially incompatible uses so that the legitimate use of land for one purpose does not detrimentally affect the use of another. Most of the area immediately west of the net SAP area is used for grazing and is not actively cultivated. For grazing land or pastureland, the Placer County General Plan establishes a 50- to 200-foot buffer. The setback provided by the future Dowd Road, a four-lane arterial (approximately 110-foot-wide right-of-way), will satisfy this buffer requirement for most of the western border of the plan area. Therefore, implementation of the project would provide an adequate buffer between the agricultural land and the new urban development.

Regarding the residential uses to the north, most of the northern portion of the net SAP area is, and would remain, under conservation easement and protected as natural open space. This large open space area would provide a substantial buffer between the existing residences and the future non-residential development.

The land in the City of Rocklin immediately east of the net SAP (and east of SR 65) is a mixture of undeveloped property, commercial and retail uses, and William Jessup University. Farther to the east, about ½-mile from the net SAP area boundary are single-family residential subdivisions. Implementation of the SAP would allow the development of business park, light industrial, and general commercial uses in areas nearest the eastern boundary of the net SAP area. Many of these uses are currently developed and are consistent with the land uses closest to the net SAP area in the City of Rocklin. In addition, SR 65 creates a substantial separation between the net SAP areas identified for urban development and the City of Rocklin. Locations of development are generally shown on the aerial imagery contained in Exhibit 4.0-1.

Development in the net SAP area would be consistent with existing surrounding land uses, as well as planned projects adjacent (or nearly adjacent) to the net SAP area, including the following projects that are also shown in Exhibit 4.0-1:

- ▲ **Lincoln Village 5 (including Special Use District (SUD) B)**, north of the net SAP area, a mix of commercial and business uses;
- ▲ **Lincoln Village 7**, adjacent to the north of the net SAP area, a mix of residential, commercial, retail, office, and community center;
- ▲ **Lincoln 270**, adjacent to the northeast of the net SAP area, a mix of residential, commercial, medical campus, and light industrial;
- ▲ **Twelve Bridges Specific Plan**, northeast of the net SAP area, a mix of residential, commercial, and recreational uses;
- ▲ **Whitney Ranch Specific Plan**, east of the net SAP area, a mix of residential, commercial, and recreational uses; and

- ▲ **Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan**, just southwest of the net SAP area and west of PRSP area, includes a mix of residential, commercial, retail, and office uses.

Development in the net SAP area would also be consistent and compatible with other regional projects shown in Exhibit 4.0-1 and listed in Table 4.0-2, as well as with current and future development trends in the surrounding area and wider region, consistent with the area's description as a developing community in the MTP/SCS. Therefore, the impact related to conflicts with existing and planned surrounding land uses would be less than significant.

PRSP Area

The PRSP area is currently undeveloped with the exception of some roadways and infrastructure. The land to the west of the PRSP area, in unincorporated Placer County, is slated for residential development through the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan, which was approved by the City of Roseville. An associated annexation to the City of Roseville was approved by the Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission on November 14, 2018. The net SAP area lies to the north and east and is mostly undeveloped with some areas of commercial and industrial uses but is also planned for eventual development as described in Chapter 3, "Project Description." The land farther east in the City of Rocklin (east of SR 65) is a mix of undeveloped land and developed commercial and educational uses. Land to the south in the City of Roseville is developed primarily with single-family residential uses.

Single-family residential uses south of the project area in the City of Roseville would be consistent with the low-density residential communities proposed along the southern portion of the PRSP.

Development in the PRSP area would be consistent with adjacent land uses, including the following projects that are also shown in Exhibit 4.0-1 (supporting the predominantly residential planned development with additional retail, commercial, and university uses):

- ▲ **Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan**, just southwest of the net SAP area and west of PRSP, includes a mix of residential, commercial, retail, and office uses;
- ▲ **Creekview Specific Plan**, obliquely adjacent to the southwest of PRSP, includes a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses; and
- ▲ **West Roseville Specific Plan**, adjacent to the south of PRSP, includes a mix of residential, commercial, and public/quasi-public uses.

Proposed development under the PRSP would be consistent and compatible with existing surrounding land uses (including other regional projects listed in Table 4.0-2), as well as with current and future development trends in the surrounding area and wider region, consistent with the area's designation as a developing community in the MTP/SCS. Therefore, the impact related to conflicts with existing and planned surrounding land uses would be less than significant.

Other Supporting Infrastructure

Pleasant Grove Retention Facility

The Pleasant Grove Retention Facility project does not include urban development. The proposed retention facility would not change the use of the land in a way that would noticeably affect surrounding rural residences and farmland. The approved West Roseville Specific Plan would be located near the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility; however, the retention facility would not conflict with the planned residential uses. There would be no conflicts with existing or planned land uses and there would be no impact with regard to land use compatibility.

Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements

Off-site improvements such as undergrounding existing above-ground utilities, and installation of underground utilities would have no or minimal aboveground components that would contribute to land use

consistency or compatibility effects. Other off-site improvements, such as a recycled water storage tank, booster pump station at the Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant, and roadway extensions represent elements of supporting infrastructure that, by their nature, are consistent with an urbanizing area. Off-site improvements would be consistent with existing and planned development and there would be no impact with regard to land use compatibility.

Conclusion

The proposed project would result in development in an area that is currently sparsely developed but slated for substantial near-term and long-term planned development. Residential uses about the SAP area to the north, east, and south, and commercial and industrial uses are also well-established in the vicinity. As evidenced by numerous specific plans and other land use plans in the region, such land development trends are continuing. The proposed land uses, consisting of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional uses supported by new roadway and utility infrastructure would be consistent and compatible with existing and planned land uses immediately adjacent to the project site and beyond. Implementation of the SAP, including the PRSP would result in a **less-than-significant** impact with regard to land use consistency and compatibility.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Impact 4.10-2: Consistency and compatibility with the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill

The proposed project includes an amendment to the County General Plan Policy 4.G.11, which would reduce the buffer around the WRSL from 1 mile (5,280 feet) to 2,000 feet for residential development, or 1,000 feet with the approval of a specific plan, master plan, or development agreement. This proposed General Plan amendment could result in land use incompatibility due to residential development occurring closer to the WRSL in areas that would otherwise remain undeveloped under the current residential buffer policy. Based on review of existing data regarding nuisance complaints from residents beyond 1 mile, it is expected that new residents and users within the project area would complain about odor from the WRSL and that the number of complaints lodged about nuisance odors would increase. Such complaints could create pressure for the Western Placer Waste Management Authority (WPWMA) to implement additional odor control and reduction measures at the WRSL and, absent measures to control odors at the source and/or at receptors, could interfere with the ability of the landfill to expand or modify needed operations. Impacts relative to consistency and compatibility of proposed land uses with the WRSL would be **potentially significant**.

Net SAP Area and PRSP Area

An amendment to County General Plan Policy 4.G.11 is proposed to permit a reduction in the 1-mile (5,280-foot) buffer zone to 2,000 feet for residential development or to 1,000 feet with approval of a specific plan, master plan, or development agreement. While the closest residential development proposed as part of the PRSP would be 2,000 feet from the landfill property line, the amended General Plan Policy 4.G.11 would allow future specific plans to propose residential development as close as 1,000 feet from the landfill property line. In addition, while residential development is not a central feature of proposed land uses in the net SAP area, housing may be incorporated as a subordinate use into SAP projects in the General Commercial, Innovation Center, Entertainment Mixed-Use, and Light Industrial land use designations. This provision would allow people to live and work in the same region, shorten commute times, and reduce vehicle miles traveled, but could put additional residential uses in closer proximity to the landfill.

A land use incompatibility issue results when land uses sited near one another cause conflicts or problems because of their proximity. For this analysis, several elements are considered in determining whether the project would be incompatible with the existing WRSL:

- ▲ odor impact screening distance and environmental factors to consider for odor impact analyses,
- ▲ existing 1-mile buffer for residential development near the WRSL per General Plan Policy 4.G.11, and
- ▲ location of existing odor complaints related to WRSL operations.

There are no state laws or regulations mandating a particular buffer distance between development and landfills to address odors and other potential effects such as increased traffic, noise, dust, and escaped trash. The Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) CEQA Handbook recommends a screening distance for sanitary landfill odor impacts of 1 mile from the landfill (PCAPCD 2017). The PCAPCD recommends that a significance determination for odor impacts be made on a case-by-case basis considering parameters such as distance, the downwind/upwind situation, prevailing wind direction, and a facility's odor complaint history. Placer County General Plan Policy 4.G.11 has established a 1-mile buffer from the WRS� property line that precludes residential development within that distance. The stated purpose of this buffer is to protect the landfill from incompatible encroachment. However, residential development within 1 mile of the landfill is not per se an incompatible use, and a buffer distance of 1 mile is large compared to many other landfill buffers in California. For example, the buffer for Kiefer Landfill in Sacramento County is 2,000 feet, or 0.38 mile; the buffer for the Central Landfill in Sonoma County is 1,320 feet, or 0.25 mile; and the buffer in Yuba County is 3,960 feet, or 0.75 mile. Established buffers are not always based on rigorous evaluation nor do they always originate with an assessment of potential odor impacts on residents. However, some buffers are based on a combination of studies and a conservative approach.

The 1-mile buffer in General Plan Policy 4.G.11 was not based on a location-specific odor study unique to the WRS�. Instead, the 1-mile buffer was based on concerns related to landfill longevity, public health, and public perceptions. Because the WRS� is an important and valuable County asset with substantial capacity and permitted to provide many more years of permitted service, the intent of the buffer and other landfill-related policies in the General Plan was to separate potentially incompatible uses, protect the landfill, and protect new uses from nuisances. Residential encroachment could create pressures on WRS� operations, resulting in the need to entertain other solutions: diverting waste to another facility, which could be costly and could result in environmental impacts; or siting a new landfill, which would likely be infeasible given cost, timing, and regulatory considerations. In addition to odors, landfills can have other effects on health and safety. Public perception as well as supported concerns can cause public outcry. Complaints directed at WRS� have been received from residents more than 2 miles away, primarily about odors, with complaints also about dust, litter, and traffic from nearer residents. Indeed, location of residential development even beyond the 1-mile buffer is not necessarily a compatible use. Most of the odor notifications in recent years have been clustered between 1 and 2 miles south of the WRS� in Roseville, as shown in Exhibit 4.3-1 (WPWMA 2018) in Section 4.3, "Air Quality." Refer also to Subsection 4.3.2, "Environmental Setting," for additional details about odor complaints/notifications associated with the WRS�. Note the area within 1 mile of the landfill is largely undeveloped. Although fewer odor notifications have been received from areas within the 1-mile buffer to the southeast and southwest of the WRS�, the reduced number of odor notifications could be explained by the lack of receptors in these areas. In addition, odor complaints documented to the east, in Rocklin, indicate that the areas southeast of the WRS� developed in accordance with the SAP would likely be subject to odor from the WRS�.

To summarize, taking into account the PCAPCD recommended screening distance, reduction in the Placer County General Plan landfill buffer, meteorological conditions (wind to the southeast and southwest), the locations of residents lodging past odor complaints, and that this project would bring development closer than development where there has been complaints, it is likely that residential development anywhere in the PRSP area to the southwest, south, and southeast of the WRS� would be subject to odor from the WRS�. Some or many future residents and users could find the odor objectionable. Additionally, residents and users may also be subject to noise, traffic, and escaped trash related to delivery of refuse and compost to the facility. Therefore, with implementation of the proposed amendment to the General Plan landfill buffer requirements, the PRSP would bring residential development closer to the WRS�, which would result in an incompatible use with the WRS�.

As described in Section 4.3, "Air Quality," WPWMA currently implements several odor control measures to minimize odors from the compost facility, landfill, and landfill gas emissions. In addition, WPWMA routinely engages with stakeholders including holding annual Odor Workshops to discuss regional odor sources and odor monitoring, odor reduction efforts, and the status of future planning efforts. However, as has occurred

elsewhere in California where residents near landfills recognize and complain about odors, notifications to the WPWMA or the PCAPCD about landfill odor could result in enforcement action and/or implementation of additional odor controls. Likewise, WPWMA could act independently to address odor complaints, given that the WPWMA has indicated that it is taking a proactive approach to controlling odors through its planning process for the Renewable Placer Waste Action Plan (Oddo, pers. comm., 2018; see Section 4.3, “Air Quality,” for a more detailed description of WPWMA’s forthcoming Waste Action Plan and existing and potential future odor management efforts). Several examples of landfills subject to odor complaints and their outcomes are provided below. Note that these examples are not exhaustive diaries of all odor complaints, legal complaints, settlements, orders, and violations at these facilities, nor are they necessarily reflective of current conditions at each facility or indicative of what is occurring at the WRSL. Rather, these examples are intended to provide a representative sample of some of the results of odor complaints at a range of locations within California.

- ▲ **Kiefer Landfill:** Kiefer Landfill is located in unincorporated Sacramento County, approximately 15 miles southeast of the City of Sacramento at the intersection of Kiefer Boulevard and Grant Line Road, adjacent to the southeastern boundary of the City of Rancho Cordova. With adoption of its 1993 General Plan, Sacramento County established a 2,000-foot buffer around the Kiefer Landfill. During the 10-year period from January 1, 1999, through December 31, 2008, no odor complaints were received by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) (Sacramento County 2013). Four odor complaints were received between 2012 and 2017. The low number of nuisance complaints may be due to the fact that the County owns approximately 3,500 acres within and adjacent to the landfill and the nearest residential development is approximately 9,500 feet (1.8 miles) away at its closest approach. While currently undeveloped, the area north of the landfill lies within the City of Rancho Cordova and is designated in the City’s General Plan as a mix of Natural Resources (open space), Residential Mixed-Density, Residential-High Density, and Local Town Center. Both the Natural Resources and Residential Mixed-Density designations lie within the landfill’s 2,000-foot buffer.
- ▲ **Sunshine Canyon Landfill:** Sunshine Canyon Landfill is in Los Angeles County, northwest of Sylmar and north of Granada Hills. The closest residences are within about 4,000 feet of the facility. The peak annual number of odor complaints since 1995 was 1,795, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) issued more than 90 notices of violation over a 3-year period (Bartholomew 2016; SCAQMD 2018). SCAQMD modified a stipulated order of abatement in March 2017 that prohibited large trash deliveries during certain hours, required diversion of organic food waste, and required better cover to control landfill gas emissions as well as improved gas collection well efficiency and integrity (SCAQMD 2017). Odor complaints have decreased (Geo-Logic Associates 2018).
- ▲ **Newby Island Resource Recovery Park:** Newby Island Resource Recovery Park is in San Jose, west of Milpitas and south of Fremont. The nearest residences are within 1 mile of the facility. Litigation over odors at the landfill resulted in a settlement agreement in July 2016, which does not require closure or preclude expansion but requires remediation to reduce odors as well as a payment to households within a certain distance of the composting facility. The settlement agreement also allowed the facility to either stop green waste composting or implement a method that would reduce odors from it (Bauer 2016). The City of San Jose approved expansion plans in 2016 (Mohammed 2017).
- ▲ **Miramar Landfill:** Miramar Landfill is in San Diego. The closest residents are within 3,000 feet of the facility. In response to a citation related to violating the local air district’s nuisance rule, the landfill implemented several practices such as avoiding turning greenery/compost on weekends and adding sprinklers to control dust (Stalmer 2017).
- ▲ **Chiquita Canyon Landfill:** Chiquita Canyon Landfill is in Los Angeles County, south of Val Verde and west of Castaic Junction. The closest residences are within 2,000 feet of the facility. The landfill was issued one Notice of Violation in a 10-year period (Chiquita Canyon 2017). SCAQMD counted 233 complaints in 2015 and 107 complaints in 2016. A 2015 study concluded that the landfill does not create significant odor impacts after collecting 2,025 data points over 25 days (Cox 2016). The Los Angeles County Board

of Supervisors approved expansion of the landfill in June 2017, even after public efforts to permanently shut down the landfill after it reached its permitted capacity (Rosengren 2017).

Based on these examples, it is likely that increased development in the vicinity of WPWMA's landfill will result in an increase in odor complaints which could lead to pressure for WPWMA to implement additional odor control measures. WPWMA is a separate legal entity and not subject to the County's regulatory authority. While the County could suggest additional odor control measures beyond those WPWMA may be currently proposing as part of its facilities planning, the County cannot mandate the same. Therefore, the following are not requirements or recommendations for the WRSL to reduce odors but instead are a range of potential odor control measures identified for purposes of this environmental review and the environmental impacts they could cause:

- ▲ **Changes to composting operations:** A possible change related to composting operations would be to apply finished compost or synthetic cover to unfinished active compost and/or enclose the composting operation, thereby reducing odor intensity. This could require minor construction (e.g., for an enclosure) and would require a change to activities within the WRSL property and likely would not result in substantial additional environmental impacts.
- ▲ **Divert waste to another facility:** While unlikely given the importance of the WRSL to the region and WPWMA's investment in existing and future facilities, waste could be diverted to another facility to limit waste disposal at the WRSL. This would likely result in increased VMT and associated air pollutant emissions, noise, and traffic to haul waste to a facility that would be farther away. This would also increase green waste odor generated at the alternate facility, which could be substantial depending on existing operations and proximity to sensitive receptors.
- ▲ **Install odor-neutralizing misters:** The WPWMA is conducting a pilot study to assess the value of odor neutralizers. If found to be effective and economically viable, misters could be installed at the perimeter to reduce odors. This could require traffic trips to deliver materials and for installation crews. There could be minimal ground disturbance in areas of installation of the misters, which are sometimes installed on tall poles, and some modest increase in water use.

See Section 4.3, "Air Quality," for a more detailed discussion of odor impacts and potential odor abatement approaches.

The kinds of measures employed to reduce odors would depend on several factors, including (1) measures already implemented at the facility, (2) source of odor, and (3) feasibility of the control measure. It is not possible to identify the exact measures that would be implemented because of the wide variation in odor sources and potential solutions. Impacts could range from negligible to severe. For example, impacts from installing misters would largely be temporary and additional water use would be minimal. However, impacts from diversion of compost to another facility could include increases in VMT and increased odor at the alternate disposal facility. An increase in VMT and its associated effects could be significant. An increase in odors at an alternate disposal facility may also be a significant impact if there are receptors nearby and odor is not well controlled.

Implementation of the proposed SAP, including the PRSP, would result in subsequent projects that could result in residential development within 2,000 feet of the landfill, or within 1,000 feet if approved through a specific plan. While measures can be implemented in an attempt to minimize landfill odors, the odors cannot be completely eliminated. Regardless of the buffer distance established through policy, implementation of the project is likely to result in an increase in the number of odor complaints received by WPWMA and PCAPCD. Such complaints could lead to increased pressure for WPWMA to implement odor control and reduction measures at the WRSL. Impacts relative to consistency and compatibility of proposed land uses with the WRSL would be **potentially significant**.

Mitigation Measures

As described in detail in Section 4.3, “Air Quality,” measures available to Placer County to mitigate odor impacts (e.g., redesign of the proposed project, implementation of a regional mitigation fee program) would be infeasible, but feasible measures are available to WPWMA, which owns and operates WRSL and MRF, including composting operations. Such measures include revised composting methods, minimizing use of fines as alternative daily cover, and appropriate and timely handling of sludge waste (see Mitigation Measures subsection of Impact 4.3-6, Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people).

With regard to land use compatibility impacts, the following mitigation is recommended:

Mitigation Measure 4.10-2: Require odor control measures for specific plans (PRSP Area and Net SAP Area)

Placer County shall require that project proponents include, as part of proposed specific plans, master plans, or development agreements, measures that would improve land use compatibility with the WRSL by reducing land use conflicts related to undesirable odor from the WRSL. Measures that can be included in specific plans, master plans, or development agreements include, but are not limited to:

▲ Building Design

- Locate air intake on the side of the building that is most-distant from the WRSL.
- Require a level of air filtration that exceeds Title 24 standards.
- Overall site orientation

▲ Landscape Design

- Require a landscape buffer zone on all land uses adjacent to the WRSL.
- Install sound walls or other solid vertical structures between residences and WRSL.

▲ Deed Notification

- Require written disclosures to initial and subsequent prospective buyers, lessees, and renters of those properties, particularly residential buyers, with information that their respective properties would potentially be subject to objectionable odors from a known nearby odor source. While this specific action would not eliminate complaints, it may reduce the frequency of complaints by those living or working closest to the landfill.

The County shall verify that these measures have been incorporated into proposed specific plans, master plans, or development agreements in order to reduce to the degree feasible the potential for land use incompatibility.

Significance after Mitigation

Mitigation Measure 4.10-2 would require implementation of measures in new development pursuant to proposed specific plans, master plans, or development agreements that would reduce perception of odor inside new structures and, to a lesser extent, outside new structures. These measures would potentially aide in increasing land use compatibility in the PRSP. However, this measure would not eliminate the source of the odor or any of the factors that contribute to intensification or range of perception of odor depending on circumstances, such as wind, temperature inversions, specific operating methods, and amount/type of waste. Therefore, this impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

Impact 4.10-3: Physical division of an established community

Implementation of the SAP, including the PRSP, would result in development in an area with little existing development, which is primarily industrial and is not considered a part of an established community. Implementation of the project would not physically divide an established community and would improve access between existing communities. There would be **no impact**.

Net SAP Area and PRSP Area

The SAP area, including the PRSP area, consists of primarily undeveloped lands, with some areas of development, which is primarily industrial. As previously described, the developments within and just outside the SAP area are not together considered an established community. LU/ED-10.3 would maintain Preserve/Mitigation Reserve areas to establish separation between some developed areas, but these undeveloped areas to be used as buffers are existing; therefore, maintenance of these areas as buffers would not divide existing established communities. Additionally, development of the SAP area would not isolate any communities because existing roads through the project area would be maintained and additional roadways through the project area would also be constructed, increasing connectivity. Several SAP policies, such as TM-1.8, TM-1.7, and TM-2.2 would also require that new development has external and internal connectivity. Implementation of the project therefore would not divide or isolate an established community. There would be no impact.

Other Supporting Infrastructure

Pleasant Grove Retention Facility

The larger Pleasant Grove Retention Facility property includes one farmhouse; however, the proposed retention facility footprint is undeveloped. The retention facility would be developed wholly within an undeveloped area and would not substantially affect local roadways. The Pleasant Grove Retention Facility therefore would not divide or isolate an established community. There would be no impact.

Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements

Off-site improvements such as relocation of a gas transmission line, undergrounding existing above-ground utilities, and installation of underground utilities would have no or minimal aboveground components and therefore would not have the potential to divide or isolate an established community. Aboveground off-site improvements, such as an additional recycled water storage tank and a booster pump station at the Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant site would not be linear and would therefore not divide or isolate an established community. Roadway extensions are identified in areas with no current adjacent development and would improve access to and within communities. Off-site improvements would therefore not physically divide or isolate an established community. There would be no impact.

Conclusion

The proposed project would result in development in an area with sparse existing development. Implementation of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community and would improve access between existing communities. There would be **no impact**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Impact 4.10-4: Economic or social changes resulting in physical environmental changes

The project would not result in an oversupply of any land uses within the market. Demand would support additional retail space developed as part of the proposed project. When considering other planned development, there also would be no oversupply, as retail would be phased in to the project in response to adequate market demand. Other factors, such as possible building repurposing, would also prevent blight if business closures occur. The project would have **no impact** with regard to adverse economic or social change.

Net SAP Area and PRSP Area

As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, the economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. However, if economic or social effects resulting from a project lead to environmental effects, this cause-and-effect relationship should be discussed. In the case of the net SAP, PRSP, and other projects with economic use, this analysis typically considers whether the project would result in oversupply of an economic use, and if the oversupply would lead to other businesses closing and, consequently, urban decay, deterioration, or blighted conditions. An example of such a situation is if a large store locates on the outskirts of a downtown, provides an oversupply of certain goods, and prices them in a manner that causes customers to no longer shop downtown. This, in turn, can cause the downtown business to shut down and the physical condition of the downtown to eventually deteriorate.

As described in “Methods and Approach,” an urban decay analysis (UDA) was prepared for the County and evaluated the buildout of the SAP. The UDA describes buildout in terms of “Phase 1” and “Phase 2.” Phase 1 assumes a time period from 2021 to 2041. The intent of the updated SAP is to provide clear direction regarding physical development and land use decisions over a 20-year horizon; Phase 1 of the updated land use plan was also based on estimated market demand for development that could occur within the 20-year plan. Phase 2, on the other hand, anticipates remaining land development likely to occur beyond the 20-year plan horizon. As a result, the UDA contains a comparison of the project to existing conditions and conditions at the end of Phase 1, which reflects cumulative conditions. The results of both analyses are reported in this discussion. The UDA evaluated the Retail Market in which the project would be located. The Retail Market Area includes Lincoln, Rocklin, and unincorporated parts of Placer County such as the SAP area and the community of Sheridan. The UDA also generally evaluated the potential for non-retail uses (i.e., office and industrial) to result in urban decay in the Office and Industrial Market Area because of the substantial amount of office and industrial uses proposed in the SAP. The Office and Industrial Market Area includes Lincoln, Loomis, Rocklin, Roseville, and unincorporated parts of Placer County such as the SAP area and areas surrounding it.

Retail

The analysis of retail effects considered the following factors: gross and occupied land uses and demographic characteristics of the project, the existing retail market within the Retail Market Area, existing and projected Retail Market Area retail demand without the project, project-generated retail demand, and cumulative retail projects in the Retail Market and their projected total sales.

The retail sector in the Retail Market Area exhibits strong market fundamentals in a changing retail environment. After recovering from the recent economic downturn, the retail sector in the Retail Market Area has reached a healthy equilibrium. Retail vacancy in the Retail Market Area is steady, remaining under 10 percent for the past two years, a reduction from several years of vacancy rates ranging between 13 percent and nearly 21 percent from 2008 through 2014. It is important to note that, throughout this 7-year period of high vacancy rates, retail inventory did not diminish (i.e., retail outlets were not abandoned), and urban decay conditions did not develop. In addition, despite disruptions in the national retail market environment, with continued retail store closures and consolidations, increasing ecommerce market share, and changing consumer preferences, the Retail Market Area and larger South Placer County retail market continues to strengthen, as it absorbed over 1.0 million square feet of retail over the past 5 years. All but 50,000 square feet of the absorbed square footage comprises newly developed community and regional-serving retail in Rocklin.

Development in the SAP area could expand the regional draw for retail in Placer County. The City of Roseville and, more recently, the City of Rocklin, have established South Placer County as a regional destination for retail shopping. The development of the SAP area has the potential to expand the regional draw north with the addition of 1,859,000 square feet of various types of retail. A comparison of Retail Market Area retail supply versus consumer demand reveals the area as an attraction market, meaning residents as well as people living outside of the Retail Market Area shop there. The project could tap into that attraction spending. In addition to establishing itself as a regional retail destination, the project could add about 19,314 new residents; substantially expand the region’s employment base with new office, research and development, and industrial uses; expand educational opportunities with the addition of the Sac State–Placer Center campus; and attract visitors to the area with unique entertainment uses adjacent to the existing Thunder Valley Casino Resort.

New retail development in the project area is not likely to result in conditions conducive to urban decay. As described in the UDA, elements of existing demand such as existing captured leakage in the Retail Market Area; captured spending from projected Retail Market Area households (excluding the project); captured spending from project households, project employees, new Sac State–Placer Center students, and visitors to the Entertainment and Mixed-Use District attractions would support additional retail space within and outside of the SAP area and Retail Market Area. The SAP retail would capture a portion of new demand and is also estimated to result in a sales shift of about 4.7 percent from existing retail in the Retail Market Area. This modest shift in spending is not likely to lead to conditions conducive to urban decay (i.e., substantial and prolonged physical deterioration of properties or structures resulting in discontinued use and investment). The percentage shift away from existing retail establishments would not exceed thresholds above which an otherwise healthy retail sector could not recover. Property owners and tenants are likely to have an economic incentive to maintain their businesses and properties with the expectation that long-term market trends will be favorable. Further, this percentage shift is estimated to decline as population and employment growth continues in the Retail Market Area.

The UDA estimates that new retail development in the PRSP alone would not result in a shift of sales from existing retail establishments in the Retail Market Area. Retail spending from various Retail Market Area and Placer Ranch populations are estimated to exceed sales generated by proposed retail in the PRSP area. A key conclusion of the UDA is that there is probable support for more retail space than is proposed in the initial phase of the PRSP. Presumably, additional retail space could be constructed in the PRSP portion of the Project during the 20-year planning period without adversely affecting existing retail, provided the retail space is supported primarily by surrounding residents, employees, and students.

Considering other planned development in the Retail Market Area, the amount of planned retail space in the Retail Market Area (including the SAP area) exceeds estimated market support. The addition of planned retail in the Retail Market Area is estimated to result in a 42 percent shift in sales from existing retail establishments. This shift represents a substantial and unsustainable shift that, if realized, has the potential to result in existing retail outlets becoming vacant or existing vacant retail outlets remaining vacant for a sustained period. However, this large shift in sales away from existing retail establishments is unlikely to occur because development of all planned retail space is unlikely to occur by the end of Phase 1 (i.e., by 2041). The cumulative impact findings suggest that there is substantially more retail planned in the Retail Market Area than could be supportable by market demand, as evidenced by an increase in retail space that far exceeds residential growth in the defined Retail Market Area. Further, based on the project-specific impact findings, the cumulative impact analysis suggests that it is retail space planned outside of the project area, specifically in Lincoln, that likely would not be fully supported by market demand. It is reasonable to assume that new retail space would be financed and developed when sufficient surrounding residential support exists. It is likely that a portion of the planned retail in the Retail Market Area would be reduced in scale or delayed beyond the timeframe of Phase 1 buildout until market conditions support development, thereby minimizing the sales shift from existing retail establishments.

Conditions conducive to urban decay are not expected to occur even in the unlikely event existing retail establishments close down in reaction to new retail planned in the Retail Market Area. Property owners and tenants have an economic incentive to maintain their businesses and properties if long-term market conditions are expected to be favorable. Even during the most-recent extended economic downturn, when vacancy rates ranged between 13 percent and nearly 21 percent over a 7-year period, the retail sector did not experience conditions related to urban decay because of an expectation that market conditions would improve. The retail sector is also inherently very competitive and dynamic, with tenants adapting formats to meet changing consumer preferences or other market trends. If vacancies occur, either because of competing new retail space or changing market dynamics, vacated spaces have the potential to be re-tenanted or repositioned with another retail or non-retail specialization or use. Finally, jurisdictions in the Retail Market Area have ordinances and code enforcement tools to address blight and signs of deferred property maintenance that assist in mitigating conditions that lead to urban decay.

To summarize, new retail development in the project area is not likely to result in conditions conducive to urban decay under either the project or cumulative scenarios. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Office and Industrial

The analysis of the potential for non-retail uses to result in urban decay considered the existing office and industrial markets within the Office and Industrial Market area. The UDA concluded that there is no evidence that suggests new office and industrial development in the project area would create conditions conducive to urban decay. The South Placer Market Area (SPMA) is expected to remain a primary employment growth hub within the Greater Sacramento region. As the region grows, the SPMA is expected to continue to capture a substantial share of the region's new jobs and households. The pace of area job and household growth would fluctuate with economic cycles during the planning timeframe, and the market would respond accordingly. Therefore, office and industrial uses would not result in conditions conducive to urban decay, and there would be no impact.

Conclusion

The project would not result in an oversupply of any land use within the market it would serve and compete with (i.e., Retail Market Area, Office and Industrial market Area). Demand would support additional retail space developed as part of the proposed project. When considering other planned development, there would not be oversupply, as retail would be phased in response to adequate market demand. Even if businesses close, there is an economic incentive for owners to maintain properties and a probability that properties could be re-tenanted or repurposed for another use. Additionally, jurisdictions have ordinances and code enforcement tools to prevent and address blight. There would be **no impact** related to urban decay.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative Impact 4.10-5: Cumulative consistency and compatibility

The proposed project would result in no impact related to consistency and compatibility with existing and planned development. Therefore, it would not contribute to any cumulative impact related to land use consistency and compatibility. There would be **no impact**.

Cumulative Impact 4.10-6: Cumulative consistency and compatibility with the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill

Because consistency and compatibility with the WRSL is a localized effect, that is, because no other cumulative projects are near the WRSL such that consistency or compatibility issues could arise, none would occur. There would be **no impact**.

Cumulative Impact 4.10-7: Contribution to physical division of an established community

The proposed project would result in no impact to physical division of an established community. Therefore, it would not contribute to any cumulative impact related to physical division of an established community. There would be **no impact**.

Cumulative Impact 4.10-8: Cumulative economic or social changes resulting in physical environmental changes

As described above under Impact 4.10-4, the UDA contains a comparison of the project to existing conditions and conditions during the 20-year planning period (Phase 1), which reflects cumulative conditions. The results of both analyses are reported in Impact 4.10-4, and as concluded, there would be **no impact**.